

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and further examination in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. By the foregoing amendments, Claims 1 - 17 have been amended.

Interview

The undersigned thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the telephone call on March 6, 2008. During the call the pending claims and Lewis (U.S. 6,233,565) were discussed. It was pointed out that the cited portions of Lewis are directed to authenticating a user, not to assuring the quality of data to be sent to a user at the request of the user. Amending the claims to clarify or highlight that the data being addressed in the claims is data to be sent to a client at the request of the client was also discussed.

Objections to the Claims

In the office action claims 2-14 and 16-17 were objected to because of informalities in their preambles. The foregoing amendments have addressed each of the informalities raised in the objections. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103

In the office action, Claims 1-7, 9-13, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6, 233,565 (Lewis). The remaining dependent claims were rejected under §103 in view of Lewis and various other references. Applicant reserves the right to challenge whether Lewis is available as prior art against the present application. Though the following remarks focus on independent claims 1, 12 and 15, they apply with equal force to each of the rejected claims.

Lewis is generally directed to systems and methods for conducting internet based financial transactions. (Lewis, Abstract) Lewis does not appear to have any description or suggestion of performing a quality assurance procedure on data that has been obtained in response to a client's request and then only transmitting that obtained data to the client if the quality assurance procedure indicates that the obtained data is not corrected. However, that is

not surprising because the main thrust of Lewis is to ensure that the client is genuine (authenticated). Lewis is not concerned with avoiding sending corrupted data (e.g. web pages or forms) in response to a client request for the data.

As is explained in the background section of the present application, a web server is an excellent target for hackers who desire to have their exploits publicized. The server usually has a captive audience that downloads information (such as web pages) from the server. By modifying the information sent out by the server, such a hacker publishes his exploits. For the owner of the server, the damage is disproportionate -- the credibility of the server is severely reduced. In addition, erroneously published information may directly harm the server's owner, for example, by misrepresenting prices of services.

Therefore, embodiments of the currently pending claims include methods and systems for verifying, by a data provider (e.g., a web server), that data which is provided meets (e.g., a web page) certain quality assurance criteria (e.g., has not been altered by a hacker). In a preferred embodiment of the invention, data is checked before it is transmitted from the data provider, to determine if it meets the certain criteria. Such a method can prevent, for example, the transmission of corrupted web pages (requested data).

For example, amended Claim 1 is directed to a method wherein a data provider receives a request for data over the internet from a client. In response to the request, the client requested data is obtained at the data provider ("obtained client requested data"). The method includes, "performing a quality assurance procedure on said **obtained client requested data** to indicate whether said **obtained client requested data** is corrupted." Then, "if said quality assurance procedure does not indicate that said **obtained client requested data** is corrupted, then transmitting said **obtained client requested data** over said Internet to said client responsive to said quality assurance procedure...." (emphasis added).

That is unlike the method described in Lewis. For example, the portion of Lewis cited in the office action as corresponding to "obtaining said client requested data" (claim 1 as currently amended) is retrieving a previously stored customer record (Lewis, col. 11, lines 51-53). Lewis does not appear to perform any quality assurance procedure on that record. The portion of Lewis cited as corresponding to "performing a quality assurance procedure on said **obtained client**

requested data” (claim 1 as currently amended, emphasis added) is a process to authenticate a user and a service provider (Lewis, col. 2, lines 29-41). It is not a quality assurance procedure performed on “said **obtained client requested data**.”

Independent Claims 12 and 15 and each of the claims which depend therefrom, are also similarly patentable over the references of record. For example, new Claim 12 includes the steps of performing quality assurance procedure on obtained data to indicate whether obtained data is corrupted. If the quality assurance procedure does not indicate that the obtained data is corrupted, then the data is transmitted to the client. If the quality assurance procedure indicates that the obtained data is corrupted, then it is not transmitted to the client. Lewis does not teach such a method.

Amended Claim 15 is directed to a system for data transmission. The system includes, inter alia, “means responsive to said request, for performing a quality assurance procedure on said **obtained client requested data** to determine whether said **obtained client requested data** is corrupted” (emphasis added). The system also includes “means for transmitting said **obtained client requested data** over said Internet to said client responsive to said quality assurance procedure if said quality assurance procedure does not indicate that said **obtained client requested data** is corrupted and for not transmitting said **obtained client requested data** to said client if said quality assurance procedure indicates that said **obtained client requested data** is corrupted” (emphasis added). Again, Lewis does not teach such a system.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are patentable over the references of record.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, amendments to the claims, the reasons therefor, and arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. In light of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is specifically requested. If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to initiate the same with the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard E. Campbell
Reg. No. 34,790

Dated: March 12, 2008.

PROCOPIO, CORY, HARGREAVES & SAVITCH LLP
530 B Street, Suite 2100
San Diego, California 92101-4469
(619) 238-1900 (Phone)
(619) 235-0398 (Fax)
Customer No. 27189